

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

January 12, 2004 LB 172

disseminate this message to our public school students? I doubt it. I doubt it. The question before us is whether or not we should be using the stature and the prestige of the public school system as a delivery agent for abortion information. We don't require the public schools to talk about alternatives to abortion. We don't insist that they talk about adoption or other alternatives. We only insist that they talk about abortion. That's wrong. Senator Schimek's amendment, again, so that there is no confusion here, she's not just changing one word from "bypass" to "waiver," she is gutting the entire bill and reestablishing the mandate, so that this abortion information can continue to flow to the public school students, starting with 12-year-olds in the 7th grade. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Foley. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I think so much of Kitty that I'm tempted to sing Happy Birthday to her. However, by the same token because I think so much of her, I shall not sing it. And I want to call everybody's attention to the fact that this is our Kitty Kearns, not Kim Carnes who sang "Bette Davis Eyes." I'm aware of a lot of things. I know a lot. I want to demonstrate that by touching on something Senator Foley just said. He talked about a provision in the statute books and wondered why no what he referred to as pro-life senator or whatever senator is opposed to his position brought a bill to mandate that the schools put what he read into the schools for dissemination. Brothers and sisters, when a pharmaceutical compound is put together, there are inert ingredients and active ingredients. The active ingredients are those that have an effect on whatever the ailment is that is to be dealt with. Other things are put in to give bulk but they do not do anything. What Senator Foley read is not an active ingredient of law. It is simply some ill-considered, politically-motivated, highly-emotional opinions that a majority of the senators were able to get into the statute books. They talk about the following provisions being motivated by legislative intrusion of the United States Supreme Court by virtue of its decision removing the protection afforded the unborn. That is a sentence with more nonsense and silliness